

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 35 and 36 have been amended, and new claims 45-48 have been added. The allowability of claims 2-10, and the allowance of claims 14-34, 37 and 41-44 are hereby noted with appreciation. Re-examination and reconsideration of the application, in view of the amendments above and the remarks below, are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 11-13, 35 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Berghefer U.S. Patent No. 5,014,452, and rejected claims 38-40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Berghefer in view of Pieper U.S. Patent No. 5,353,530. Of these claims, claims 1, 35 and 36 are independent claims. Independent claim 1 is directed to a snowplow and mount assembly. It now calls for the first and second latch pins to be normally biased toward the latched position, and for the latch lever to simultaneously free the latch pins to move to the latched position and move the latch pins to the unlatched position. Claim 35 is directed to a method of attaching a snowplow frame to a mount frame. It now calls for the first and second latch pins to be normally biased toward the latched position, and for the lever to simultaneously free the latch pins to move to the latched position. Claim 36 is directed to a method of detaching a snowplow frame from a mount frame. It now calls for the first and second latch pins to be normally biased toward the latched position, and for the lever to simultaneously free the latch pins to move to the latched position. All three of these claims clearly define over Berghefer as

Application Serial No. 09/878,744
Amendment dated 02/28/03
Reply to Office Action of August 28, 2003

there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation in Berghefer for providing latch pins which are normally biased, such as, for example, by spring force, pneumatic force, hydraulic force, gravitational force or otherwise, to the latched position, and a lever for simultaneously freeing the latch pins to move to the latched position. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 1, 35 and 36 are clearly allowable over Berghefer, as are the claims dependent thereon heretofore rejected by the Examiner.

The Examiner indicated that claims 2-10 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants have so rewritten independent claim 2 and it is submitted that claims 2-10 are now in a condition for allowance.

Lastly, Applicants have added new claims 45-48 which define further patentable subject matter.

In view of the above, it is submitted that claims 1-48 are in condition for allowance. Re-examination of the application is respectfully requested, and an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

By: 

Wayne L. Jacobs
Reg. No. 35,553

2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
Phone: (513) 241-2324
Fax: (513) 421-7269